

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/373,230	08/12/1999	HARUKI OKMURA	OKAMURA=2E 2359		
	7590 01/29/200 D NEIMARK, P.L.L.C	EXAMINER			
624 NINTH STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			JIANG, DONG		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		1646		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/29/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/373,230	OKMURA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Dong Jiang	1646		

·	Dong Jiang	1646				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 04 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complian time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aft otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	fidavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejection E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	stension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since			
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	. will not be entered b	ecause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co						
(b) \square They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below						
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.3)						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) ellowed:		Il be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		•				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>3-9, 11, 14 and 16</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good are was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence is	necessary and			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ied.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:						
	Gunanti)				
	GARY B. NICKOL, PH. I)				
		BAIRIPP PL				

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the newly added claim 18 recites limitation "which has an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:2, ..., and wherein, in SEQ ID NO:2, (i) one or more amino acids are replaced ..., (ii) one or more amino acids are added ..., and/or (iii) one or more amino acids are added ..., and/or (iii) one or more amino acids ... are deleted", which renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear how a molecule having SEQ ID NO:2 can also have replacements, additions or deletions of amino acids in the same time. Further, with respect to the limitation "(i) one or more amino acids are replaced with other amino acids", it is unclear what is the upper limitation of numbers of the amino acids for the replacement. Given the broadest reasonable interpretation, it reads on an indefinite number of amino acid residues being substituted while retaining the biological property, up to and including replacement of the entire protein, i.e., it reads on molecules of the functional equivalent that may not share structural similarity to the protein of SEQ ID NO:2. As such, the proposed amendments raise new issues that would require further consideration and new grounds of rejections, and therefore, they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.